An analytic calculation of the growth index for $f(R)$ dark energy model

Qing-Guo Huang*
State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing 100190, People's Republic of China
(Dated: July 4, 2014)

We derive the analytic formula of the growth index for $f(R)$ dark energy model where the effect on the growth of matter density perturbation δ_m from modified gravity (MG) is encoded in the effective Newton coupling constant $G_{\rm eff}$ in MG (or equivalently $g \equiv G_{\rm eff}/G$). Based on the analytic formula, we propose that the parameter g can be directly figured out by comparing the observed growth rate $f_g \equiv d\ln\delta_m/d\ln a$ to the prediction of f_g in general relativity.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x

arXiv:1403.0655v3 [astro-ph.CO] 2 Jul 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

The accelerating expansion of present Universe was discovered by type Ia supernovae [1, 2]. Up to now, the standard ΛCDM model in the framework of general relativity (GR) is able to explain the present cosmic acceleration within observational errors. However how to explain the tiny value of the cosmological constant compared to the known physical scales is still a big challenge.

Modified gravity (MG), for example the $f(R)$ gravity, provides a geometrical origin to the present cosmic acceleration. The basic idea of MG dark energy is that gravity is modified on the cosmological scales when the Ricci scalar R is of order of today's Ricci scalar R_0, while GR is recovered in the region of $R \gg R_0$. However it is quite non-trivial to construct a viable $f(R)$ dark energy model which is consistent with both cosmological and local gravity constraints. See some typical viable $f(R)$ dark energy models in [3–9]. It is useful to introduce the effective equation of state parameter $w = p_{\rm de}/\rho_{\rm de}$ to describe the difference between Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) background evolutions of MG and the standard ΛCDM model, where the effective pressure $p_{\rm de}$ and energy density $\rho_{\rm de}$ are determined by using the Einsteinian representation of gravitational field equations. On the other hand, since the gravity in MG is different from GR, the evolution of the matter density perturbation $\delta_m \equiv \delta\rho_m/\rho_m$ provides a crucial tool to distinguish MG dark energy model from dark energy model in GR, in particular the standard ΛCDM model. For simplicity, the growth rate f_g of matter density perturbation can be parametrized by, [10],

$$f_g \equiv \frac{d\ln\delta_m}{d\ln a} \equiv \Omega_m(z)^{\gamma(z)}, \tag{1}$$

where a is the scale factor, $\Omega_m(z)$ is the density parameter for dust-like matter at redshift z, and $\gamma(z)$ is the so-called growth index. In ΛCDM model in GR, $w = -1$ and

$$\gamma \simeq 6/11, \tag{2}$$

[11, 12].

Generically the effect on the matter density perturbation in MG is encoded in the effective Newton coupling constant $G_{\rm eff}$. For simplicity, we introduce a new quantity $g \equiv G_{\rm eff}/G$ to measure the difference between MG and GR. In general, w is time dependent and g is time and scale dependent in MG, and then the growth index γ is expected to be time and scale dependent. During deep matter dominant era GR is recovered, while the gravity is modified in the low redshift era when the cosmic acceleration occurs. One can expect that the evolutions of both FRW background and matter density perturbation in MG are too complicated to be solved analytically from the deep matter dominant era to accelerating era.

In this paper we focus on the growth of matter density perturbation in the $f(R)$ dark energy model. We suppose that g is parametrized as follows

$$g = g_0 + g_1(1-\Omega_m), \tag{3}$$

where g_0 and g_1 are two constants. Here g_1 is used to characterize the time-evolution of g. Note that both $g_0 = g_0(k)$ and $g_1 = g_1(k)$ are scale dependent generically. In the deep matter dominant era ($\Omega_m \to 1$), GR should be recovered and then $g \to 1$. But g can deviate from one at low redshift. This parameterization can cover many viable $f(R)$ dark energy models at low redshift. Based on such a parameterization, we analytically solve the equation of motion of δ_m and work out an analytic formula of the growth index. Furthermore, we find that g can be directly figured out by comparing the observed growth rate f_g to the prediction of f_g in GR.

This paper will be organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we briefly review the $f(R)$ dark energy model. In Sec. 3 we analytically calculate the growth index for $f(R)$ dark energy model. Summary and discussion are given in Sec. 4.

*Electronic address: huangqg@itp.ac.cn

II. A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE $f(R)$ DARK ENERGY MODEL

Let's start with the following action

$$S = \frac{1}{16\pi G}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}f(R) + S_m, \tag{4}$$

where G is the Newton coupling constant, S_m is the action for the matter, $R = 6(2H^2 + \dot{H})$ and H denotes the Hubble parameter. If $f(R) = R - 2\Lambda$, the above action reduces to the Einstein-Hilbert action for the ΛCDM model in GR. In this paper we consider $f(R)$ vanishes for $R = 0$, which implies that no cosmological constant is introduced. The $f(R)$ gravity contains a new scalar degree of freedom dubbed "scalaron" whose mass depends on the Ricci scalar R [13]. The stability of $f(R)$ theory requires

$$F \equiv f_{,R} > 0, \quad F_{,R} \equiv f_{,RR} > 0, \tag{5}$$

where $f_{,R} = df(R)/dR$ and $F_{,R} = dF(R)/dR$. The former condition implies that gravity is attractive and graviton is not a ghost, and the latter condition means that scalaron is not a tachyon. In addition, the viable $f(R)$ dark energy model is required to be similar to the ΛCDM model during the radiation and deep matter dominant era, but important observable deviations from the ΛCDM model appears at low redshift. In order to measure such a deviation, we can introduce a dimensionless quantity defined by $\beta \equiv RF_{,R}/F$ which satisfies $0 < \beta < 1$ [3, 14].

Considering S_m describes the dust-like matter (the pressure of dust-like matter equals zero), the equations of motion for the FRW background take the form

$$\begin{aligned} H^2 &= \frac{1}{3}\left[\frac{1}{2}(FR - f) - 3H\dot{F} - 3(F-1)H^2\right] \\ &+ \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho_m, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$-2\dot{H} = \ddot{F} - H\dot{F} + 2(F-1)\dot{H} + 8\pi G\rho_m. \tag{7}$$

Here we focus on the late time Universe where the radiation can be ignored. From these two equations, the effective energy density and pressure of $f(R)$ dark energy are respectively given by

$$\rho_{\rm de} = \frac{1}{8\pi G}\left[\frac{1}{2}(FR - f) - 3H\dot{F} - 3(F-1)H^2\right], \tag{8}$$

$$p_{\rm de} = -\rho_{\rm de} + \frac{1}{8\pi G}\left[\ddot{F} - H\dot{F} + 2(F-1)\dot{H}\right], \tag{9}$$

and then the effective equation of state parameter w reads

$$w = -1 + \frac{\ddot{F} - H\dot{F} + 2(F-1)\dot{H}}{\frac{1}{2}(FR - f) - 3H\dot{F} - 3(F-1)H^2}. \tag{10}$$

Combining Eqs. (6) and (7), the Ricci scalar becomes

$$R = 3\left[1 - 3w(1 - \Omega_m)\right]H^2, \tag{11}$$

where

$$\Omega_m \equiv \frac{8\pi G\rho_m}{3H^2} \tag{12}$$

is the density parameter for the dust-like matter.

Many typical viable $f(R)$ dark energy models which are consistent with both cosmological and local gravity constraints are summarized in [14]. All of them can be written in the following form

$$f(R) = R - \lambda R_s Y(x), \tag{13}$$

where $x = R/R_s$, $R_s(> 0)$ is a characteristic value of R and λ is a positive parameter. The function $Y(x)$ in the viable model takes the form: (i) $Y(x) = x^p$ $(0 < p < 1)$ [3], (ii) $Y(x) = x^{2n}/(x^{2n} + 1)$ $(n > 0)$ [4], (iii) $Y(x) = 1 - (1 + x^2)^{-n}$ $(n > 0)$ [6], (iv) $Y(x) = 1 - e^{-x}$ [8, 9], (v) $Y(x) = \tanh(x)$ [7], etc. We find that all of these models satisfy $F = f_{,R} < 1$.

III. THE ANALYTIC FORMULA OF THE GROWTH INDEX FOR $f(R)$ DARK ENERGY MODEL

From now on, we will focus on the evolution of matter density perturbation in MG. In the sub-horizon limit, the evolution of matter density fluctuation δ_m is govern by,

$$\ddot{\delta}_m + 2H\dot{\delta}_m - 4\pi G_{\rm eff}\rho_m\delta_m = 0, \tag{14}$$

$$G_{\rm eff} = g(a, k, R)\cdot G, \tag{15}$$

where

$$g(a, k, R) \equiv \frac{1}{F}\left(1 + \frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{1 + \frac{M^2a^2}{k^2}}\right), \tag{16}$$

in [15, 16], or without taking any approximation at the matter-dominant stage [17, 18]

$$g(a, k, R) = 1 + \frac{8}{3}\frac{4/F - 3}{27 + 8\left(\frac{k^2}{a^2M^2}\right)^4}\left(\frac{k^2}{a^2M^2}\right)^4, \tag{17}$$

and

$$M^2 = \frac{R}{3\beta} = \frac{F}{3F_{,R}}. \tag{18}$$

Here M is nothing but the mass of scalaron. The positivities of both $f_{,R}$ and $f_{,RR}$ guarantee the positivity of the mass square of scalaron. In the scales which are much smaller than M^{-1}, GR is recovered, and the gravity is modified in the scales around or larger than M^{-1}. In addition, considering (16) or (17) with $F < 1$, we find $g > 1$ for the viable $f(R)$ dark energy models in the literatures.

In the deep matter dominant era, $a \sim t^{2/3}$ and then Eq. (14) becomes

$$\ddot{\delta}_m + \frac{4}{3t}\dot{\delta}_m - \frac{2}{3t^2}g\delta_m = 0, \tag{19}$$

whose solution is given by $\delta_m \sim t^{\frac{\sqrt{1+24g}-1}{6}} \sim a^{\frac{\sqrt{1+24g}-1}{4}}$, where g is taken as a constant. In this era, GR is proposed to be recovered ($g \to 1$) and then $\delta_m \sim a$.

Now let's switch to the late time Universe where the energy densities of effective dark energy and dust-like matter are comparable to each other. Eq. (14) can be re-written as follows

$$\frac{d^2\ln\delta_m}{d\ln a^2} + \left(\frac{d\ln\delta_m}{d\ln a}\right)^2 + \frac{d\ln\delta_m}{d\ln a}\left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}w(1-\Omega_m)\right] = \frac{3}{2}g\Omega_m, \quad (20)$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{df_g}{d\ln a} + f_g^2 + f_g\left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}w(1-\Omega_m)\right] = \frac{3}{2}g\Omega_m. \quad (21)$$

From Eqs. (6), (7) and (12), we have

$$\frac{d\Omega_m}{d\ln a} = 3w\Omega_m(1-\Omega_m). \quad (22)$$

Combining with the definition of the growth index γ in Eq. (1), Eq. (20) becomes

$$3w\Omega_m(1-\Omega_m)\ln\Omega_m\frac{d\gamma}{d\Omega_m} + 3w(\gamma - \frac{1}{2})(1-\Omega_m) + \Omega_m^\gamma - \frac{3}{2}g\Omega_m^{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} = 0. \quad (23)$$

Usually the form of $g(a,k,R)$ is expected to be very complicated. In order to capture the main feature of $f(R)$ dark energy model at low redshift, we expand g as a power series about $(1-\Omega_m) \sim 0$ for a given perturbation mode k,

$$g = \sum_{n=0} g_n(1-\Omega_m)^n. \quad (24)$$

In this paper we take the first two terms like that in Eq. (3) into account. [1] For slowly varying equation of state parameter w ($|dw/d\Omega_m| \ll (1-\Omega_m)$), the solution of Eq. (23) takes the form

$$\gamma = \frac{c_{-1}}{1-\Omega_m} + c_0 + c_1(1-\Omega_m) + \mathcal{O}\left((1-\Omega_m)^2\right), \quad (25)$$

where c_{-1}, c_0 and c_1 can be calculated order by order,

$$c_{-1} = \ln\frac{1+\sqrt{1+24g_0}}{6g_0}, \quad (26)$$

$$c_0 = 1 - \frac{c_{-1}}{2} + \frac{-2+3e^{c_{-1}}w - 3e^{2c_{-1}}g_1}{2+3e^{2c_{-1}}g_0 - 6e^{c_{-1}}w}, \quad (27)$$

$$c_1 = \frac{(c_{-1}^2 + 4c_{-1}c_0 - 4(1-c_0)c_0)(2-3e^{2c_{-1}}g_0)}{8(2+3e^{2c_{-1}}g_0 - 12e^{c_{-1}}w)} - \frac{c_{-1}(4-3e^{2c_{-1}}g_0 - 6e^{c_{-1}}w)}{6(2+3e^{2c_{-1}}g_0 - 12e^{c_{-1}}w)} + \frac{3g_1(1-c_{-1}/2-c_0)e^{2c_{-1}}}{2+3e^{2c_{-1}}g_0 - 12e^{c_{-1}}w}. \quad (28)$$

[1] The case with $g_0 = 1$ is discussed in [19].

The expressions of the higher order terms are quite complicated, and the readers can easily work them out once they need. Here the first two terms on the right hand side of Eq. (25) make main contributions to γ and the term with c_1 is roughly negligible if both (g_0-1) and g_1 are much less than one. If $g_0 \neq 1$, the growth index is expected to be time-evolving, and the ansatz with a constant growth index is not generic for $f(R)$ dark energy model. Our analytic formula indicates that a better ansatz for γ is

$$\gamma(z) \simeq \frac{\gamma_{-1}}{1-\Omega_m} + \gamma_0 + \gamma_1(1-\Omega_m), \quad (29)$$

where γ_{-1}, γ_0 and γ_1 are constants.

For $g_0 = 1$ and $g_1 = 0$, our result reduces to GR where $c_{-1} = 0$, $c_0 = \frac{3(1-w)}{5-6w}$ and $c_1 = \frac{3}{125}\frac{(1-w)(1-3w/2)}{(1-6w/5)^2(1-12w/5)}$. [2] For $g_0 = 1$,

$$c_{-1} = 0, \quad c_0 = \frac{3(1-g_1-w)}{5-6w}. \quad (30)$$

In Dvali-Gabadadze-Porrati (DGP) model [20, 21], $g = 1 - \frac{1}{3}\frac{1-\Omega_m^2}{1+\Omega_m^2}$. In the matter dominant era, $g \to 1 - \frac{1}{3}(1-\Omega_m)$ and $w \to -1/2$, and thus $\gamma \simeq 11/16$ which is the same as that in [10].

Nowadays the property of dark energy has been tightly constrained from observations [22]. ΛCDM model can fit the data, and the room for $f(R)$ dark energy model has been tightly constrained, for example $|g_0 - 1| \lesssim \mathcal{O}(0.1)$ and $|g_1| \lesssim \mathcal{O}(0.1)$. Therefore c_{-1} and c_0 can be expanded around the case of GR ($g_0 = 1$ and $g_1 = 0$),

$$c_{-1} = -\frac{3}{5}(g_0-1) + \mathcal{O}((g_0-1)^2), \quad (31)$$

$$c_0 = \frac{3(1-g_1-w)}{5(1-6w/5)} + \frac{9(7+18g_1-20w-12g_1w+12w^2)}{250(1-6w/5)^2}(g_0-1) + \mathcal{O}((g_0-1)^2). \quad (32)$$

For $w = -1$ and $g_1 = 0$, $c_0 \simeq \frac{6}{11} + \frac{351}{1210}(g_0-1)$.

Applying our analytic formula in (25) to Eq. (1), we can easily calculate the growth rate $f_g(z)$. Testing growth rate f_g from our analytic result in (25) against the value obtained by numerical calculation, the accuracy at low redshift ($z \lesssim 1$) is better than a few percents. Combining Eq. (25) with Eq. (1) and expanding f_g up to the order of $(1-\Omega_m)^2$, we have

$$f_g(z) = e^{-c_{-1}-(c_{-1}/2+c_0)(1-\Omega_m)+\mathcal{O}\left((1-\Omega_m)^2\right)}, \quad (33)$$

[2] The denominator of c_1 is slightly different from that in [11] where $c_1 = \frac{3}{125}\frac{(1-w)(1-3w/2)}{(1-6w/5)^3}$.

where

$$\frac{c_{-1}}{2}+c_0 = \frac{3(1-g_1-w)}{5(1-6w/5)} - \frac{3(2-27g_1+18g_1w)}{125(1-6w/5)^2}(g_0-1) + \mathcal{O}((g_0-1)^2). \quad (34)$$

Since the first term on the right hand side of Eq. (34) is dominant, we have

$$\frac{f_{g,\rm MG}(z)}{f_{g,\rm GR}(z)} \simeq \exp\left[-c_{-1}+\frac{3g_1\Omega_{\rm de}(z)}{5-6w}\right], \quad (35)$$

where $\Omega_{\rm de}=(1-\Omega_m)$ is the dark energy density parameter. For $g_1=0$ and $g_0>1$ (or equivalently $c_{-1}<0$) which implies that gravity is stronger than GR, the growth rate of matter density perturbation is enhanced by a factor $e^{-c_{-1}}$. Motivated by Eq. (35), we propose

$$1-\frac{5}{3}c_{-1}+\frac{g_1\Omega_{\rm de}(z)}{1-6w/5} \simeq r_{g,\rm obs}(z), \quad (36)$$

where

$$r_{g,\rm obs}(z) \equiv 1+\frac{5}{3}\ln\frac{f_{g,\rm obs}(z)}{f_{g,\rm GR}(z)}. \quad (37)$$

Note that c_{-1} is a function of g_0. Once we can construct the relation between $r_g(z)$ and $\Omega_{\rm de}$ from cosmological observations, we can easily figure out g_0 and g_1. Roughly speaking, the value of g_0 can be determined by the value of $r_{g,\rm obs}(z)$ when $\Omega_{\rm de}\simeq 0$, and g_1 is related to the tilt of $r_{g,\rm obs}(z)$ at low redshift. If $|g_0-1|\lesssim\mathcal{O}(0.1)$, Eq. (36) becomes

$$g_0+\frac{g_1\Omega_{\rm de}(z)}{1-6w/5} \simeq r_{g,\rm obs}(z), \quad (38)$$

which indicates that the redshift-independent part of $r_{g,\rm obs}(z)$ is equal to g_0.

In the literatures, one may prefer to constrain $f_g\sigma_8(z)$ from cosmological observations, where σ_8 is today's root-mean-square mass fluctuation on $8h^{-1}$ Mpc. Because the equation of motion of δ_m is a linear equation, one can define a normalized growth function $D(z)$ via

$$D(z) \equiv \delta_m(z)/\delta_m(z=0), \quad (39)$$

and then $\sigma_8(z)=\sigma_8 D(z)$. Solving Eq. (1), we get

$$D(z)=\frac{1}{1+z}\exp\left[\int_0^z\left(1-\Omega_m(z')^{\gamma(z')}\right)\frac{dz'}{1+z'}\right]. \quad (40)$$

Therefore

$$f_g\sigma_8(z)=D(z)\Omega_m(z)^{\gamma(z)}\sigma_8. \quad (41)$$

Using our analytic result, $f_g\sigma_8(z)$ is plotted in Fig. 1. Roughly speaking, if $|g_0-1|\lesssim 1$ and $|g_1|\lesssim 1$, g_0 shifts the amplitude of $f_g\sigma_8(z)$ and g_1 changes the shape of $f_g\sigma_8(z)$.



FIG. 1: The plot of $f_g\sigma_8(z)$. Here we adopt $w=-1$, $\Omega_m^0=0.315$ and $\sigma_8=0.829$. The red solid, blue dashed, blue dotted and blue solid curves correspond to ΛCDM model, $g=1.3$, $g=1-0.5(1-\Omega_m)$ and $g=1.3-0.5(1-\Omega_m)$ respectively.

IV. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

To summarize, we analytically calculate the growth index in the $f(R)$ dark energy model. Actually our results are applicable for more general MG dark energy models, for example $f(T)$ dark energy model [23–26], as long as the effect on the growth of matter density perturbation from MG is encoded in $g=G_{\rm eff}/G$. As we know, there are two key parameters for MG dark energy model, namely w and $G_{\rm eff}$ (or equivalently g). The former parameter determines the expansion history of our Universe, and the latter parameter tells us how the matter density perturbation grows up. Adopting the analytic formula, we find a simple relation between g and the growth rate in Eq. (35), and then we propose that g can be directly figured out by comparing the observed growth rate f_g to the prediction of f_g in GR. In the literatures, one would like to use $f_g\sigma_8(z)$ to characterize the growth of matter density perturbation. In this case one can also use our analytic formula to calculate $f_g\sigma_8(z)$ and then fit out g_0 and A from the data.

Recently the anisotropic clustering of the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) CMASS Data Release 11 (DR11) sample was analyzed. The combination of Planck and CMASS implies $\gamma=0.772^{+0.124}_{-0.097}$ and a similar result $\gamma=0.76\pm0.11$ is obtained when replacing Planck with WMAP9 in [27]. Both results deviate from the prediction of ΛCDM in GR at more than 2σ level. The large value of γ may come from the the large value of σ_8 from Planck, or it is just a statistical fluctuation. Considering $f_g\sigma_8(z=0.57)=0.419\pm0.044$ from BOSS CMASS DR11, we obtain $g_0\simeq 0.73$ in the reference ΛCDM model ($\Omega_m^0=0.315$ and $\sigma_8=0.829$) from Planck [22]. A careful data fitting will be done in the near future [28]. In a word, if such a deviation is confirmed in the future, we really need to modify the gravity.

Finally see some other aspects on $f(R)$ dark energy

model in [29–44] etc.

Acknowledgments

This work was initiated during High1-2014 KIAS-NCTS joint workshop on particle physics, string theory and cosmology. Q.-G.H. is supported by the project of Knowledge Innovation Program of Chinese Academy of Science and grants from NSFC (grant NO. 10821504, 11322545 and 11335012).

[1] S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999) [astro-ph/9812133].
[2] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998) [astro-ph/9805201].
[3] L. Amendola, R. Gannouji, D. Polarski and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 083504 (2007) [gr-qc/0612180].
[4] W. Hu and I. Sawicki, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 064004 (2007) [arXiv:0705.1158 [astro-ph]].
[5] S. A. Appleby and R. A. Battye, Phys. Lett. B **654**, 7 (2007) [arXiv:0705.3199 [astro-ph]].
[6] A. A. Starobinsky, JETP Lett. **86**, 157 (2007) [arXiv:0706.2041 [astro-ph]].
[7] S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 023507 (2008) [arXiv:0709.1391 [astro-ph]].
[8] G. Cognola, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, L. Sebastiani and S. Zerbini, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 046009 (2008) [arXiv:0712.4017 [hep-th]].
[9] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 123528 (2009) [arXiv:0905.2962 [astro-ph.CO]].
[10] E. V. Linder and R. N. Cahn, Astropart. Phys. **28**, 481 (2007) [astro-ph/0701317].
[11] L. -M. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, Astrophys. J. **508**, 483 (1998) [astro-ph/9804015].
[12] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 043529 (2005) [astro-ph/0507263].
[13] A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Lett. B **91**, 99 (1980).
[14] S. Tsujikawa, R. Gannouji, B. Moraes and D. Polarski, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 084044 (2009) [arXiv:0908.2669 [astro-ph.CO]].
[15] P. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 123504 (2006) [astro-ph/0511218].
[16] S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 023514 (2007) [arXiv:0705.1032 [astro-ph]].
[17] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, A. Dobado and A. L. Maroto, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 123515 (2008) [arXiv:0802.2999 [astro-ph]].
[18] H. Motohashi, A. A. Starobinsky and J. 'i. Yokoyama, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **18**, 1731 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0730 [astro-ph.CO]].
[19] P. G. Ferreira and C. Skordis, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 104020 (2010) [arXiv:1003.4231 [astro-ph.CO]].
[20] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. B **485**, 208 (2000) [hep-th/0005016].
[21] C. Deffayet, G. R. Dvali and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 044023 (2002) [astro-ph/0105068].
[22] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
[23] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 127301 (2010) [Erratum-ibid. D **82**, 109902 (2010)] [arXiv:1005.3039 [astro-ph.CO]].
[24] K. Bamba, C. -Q. Geng and C. -C. Lee, JCAP **1008**, 021 (2010) [arXiv:1005.4574 [astro-ph.CO]].
[25] R. Zheng and Q. -G. Huang, JCAP **1103**, 002 (2011) [arXiv:1010.3512 [gr-qc]].
[26] W. -S. Zhang, C. Cheng, Q. -G. Huang, M. Li, S. Li, X. -D. Li and S. Wang, Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron. **55**, 2244 (2012) [arXiv:1202.0892 [astro-ph.CO]].
[27] F. Beutler *et al.* [BOSS Collaboration], arXiv:1312.4611 [astro-ph.CO].
[28] Q. -G. Huang et al., to appear.
[29] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Living Rev. Rel. **13**, 3 (2010) [arXiv:1002.4928 [gr-qc]].
[30] S. 'i. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rept. **505** (2011) 59 [arXiv:1011.0544 [gr-qc]].
[31] D. Polarski and R. Gannouji, Phys. Lett. B **660**, 439 (2008) [arXiv:0710.1510 [astro-ph]].
[32] H. Wei, Phys. Lett. B **664**, 1 (2008) [arXiv:0802.4122 [astro-ph]].
[33] Y. Gong, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 123010 (2008) [arXiv:0808.1316 [astro-ph]].
[34] R. Gannouji, B. Moraes and D. Polarski, JCAP **0902**, 034 (2009) [arXiv:0809.3374 [astro-ph]].
[35] K. Bamba, C. -Q. Geng, S. 'i. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 083014 (2009) [arXiv:0810.4296 [hep-th]].
[36] P. Wu, H. W. Yu and X. Fu, JCAP **0906**, 019 (2009) [arXiv:0905.3444 [gr-qc]].
[37] T. Biswas, E. Gerwick, T. Koivisto and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 031101 (2012) [arXiv:1110.5249 [gr-qc]].
[38] K. Bamba, A. Lopez-Revelles, R. Myrzakulov, S. D. Odintsov and L. Sebastiani, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 015008 (2013) [arXiv:1207.1009 [gr-qc]].
[39] J. -h. He and B. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 023508 (2013) [arXiv:1208.1388 [astro-ph.CO]].
[40] S. Basilakos, S. Nesseris and L. Perivolaropoulos, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 12, 123529 (2013) [arXiv:1302.6051 [astro-ph.CO]].
[41] A. Abebe, A. de la Cruz-Dombriz and P. K. S. Dunsby, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 044050 (2013) [arXiv:1304.3462 [astro-ph.CO]].
[42] L. Xu, arXiv:1306.2683 [astro-ph.CO].
[43] J. Dossett, B. Hu and D. Parkinson, arXiv:1401.3980 [astro-ph.CO].
[44] A. Pouri, S. Basilakos and M. Plionis, arXiv:1402.0964 [astro-ph.CO].